



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/441,822 11/17/99 DANZL K 021.12-0001

WM01/1023

STEVEN R. FUNK
ALTERA LAW GROUP, LLC
6500 CITY WEST PARKWAY
SUITE 100
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55344-7701

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED:

10/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/441,822

Applicant(s)

DANZL ET AL.

Examiner

Duc M Nguyen

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McNair (5,504,810).

Consider claim 1. McNair teaches a method for reporting calls having associated call transaction data (ANI, col. 6, ln. 27), the calls being from a call originator to a call recipient, comprising accessing the call transaction data (col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 46); determining an approximate longitude and latitude of the call originator for each call using the call transaction data (col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 46); and storing the approximate longitude and latitude (see fig. 5; col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 46).

Consider claims 5-6. McNair teaches using telephone line number of the call originator to obtain the approximate longitude and latitude (col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 46, fig.5).

Consider claims 7-9. McNair further teaches using area code and exchange code (Automatic Number Identification The billing number of the calling party in a telephone call. Enables IECs to bill telephone calls without requiring customers to enter PINs. Provided by the

Art Unit: 2643

originating LEC) of the call originator to obtain the approximate longitude and latitude (col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 46, fig.5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNair (5,504,810) in view of Walter (5,999,604).

Consider claim 2. McNair does not teach generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data.

Walter teaches generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data (col. 2, ln. 39-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Walter into the teachings of McNair in order to provide several levels of services impact reporting, thus providing users with more versatile and detailed network management capabilities.

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claim 35. McNair teaches a method for reporting calls having associated call transaction data (ANI, col. 6, ln. 27), the calls being from a call originator to a call recipient, comprising accessing the call transaction data (col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 46); determining an approximate longitude and latitude of the call originator for each call using the call transaction data (col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 46); and storing the approximate longitude and latitude (see fig. 5; col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 46). McNair does not teach displaying a plurality of variable telecommunication transaction attributes associated with each call.

Walter teaches displaying a plurality of variable telecommunication transaction attributes associated with each call (e.g., generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data; col. 2, ln. 39-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Walter into the teachings of McNair in order to provide several levels of services impact reporting, thus providing users with more versatile and detailed network management capabilities.

5. Claims 3-4, 10-17, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNair (5,504,810) in view of Walter (5,999,604) as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Shaffer et al (5,901,214).

Consider claims 3-4. McNair in view of Walter does not teach converting from the postal code (zip code or extended zip code) to a corresponding longitude and latitude.

Art Unit: 2643

Shaffer teaches converting from the postal code (zip code or extended zip code) to a corresponding longitude and latitude (col. 8, ln. 7-32; col. 11, ln. 26 to col. 12, ln. 26; col. 16, ln. 52 to col. 17, ln. 37; col. 24, ln. 20-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Shaffer into the teachings of McNair in view of Walter in order to provide benefits, such as improved connection efficiency.

Consider claims 10-11. Shaffer further teaches converting from the postal code (zip code or extended zip code) to a corresponding longitude and latitude (col. 8, ln. 7-32; col. 11, ln. 26 to col. 12, ln. 26; col. 16, ln. 52 to col. 17, ln. 37; col. 24, ln. 20-67).

Consider claims 12-13, 15. Shaffer further teaches converting from the are code and exchange code to a corresponding longitude and latitude (col. 16, ln. 12-51; col. 38, ln. 26-59).

Consider claims 14, 16. Walter further teaches the limitations of claims 14, 16 in (col. 38, ln. 45-53).

Consider claim 17. McNair further teaches the limitations of claim 17 in fig. 5.

Consider claims 21-25. Walter further teaches the limitations of claim 21-25 in (col. 5, ln. 35 to col. 7, ln. 4).

6. Claims 18-20, 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter (5,999,604) in view of Brouckman et al (6,134,307).

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claims 18, 26. Walter teaches a method for reporting call records of calls having associated call transaction data, comprising accessing the call transaction data (col. 2, ln. 39-54; col. 5, ln. 11 to col. 7, ln. 4); and generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data (col. 2, ln. 39-54; col. 5, ln. 11 to col. 7, ln. 4).

Walter does not clearly teach verifying the validity of the call transaction data; and if the call transaction data is valid, generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data.

Brouckman teaches verifying the validity of the call transaction data; and if the call transaction data is valid (col. 5, ln. 1-46), generating billing event records (BER).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Brouckman into the teachings of Walter in order to provide several levels of services impact reporting, thus providing users with more versatile and detailed network management capabilities.

Consider claim 19. Walter further teaches the limitations of claim 19 in (fig. 1; col. 5, ln. 11-34).

Consider claim 20. Walter further teaches the limitations of claim 20 in (col. 5, ln. 35 to col. 7, ln. 4).

Consider claims 27, 29. Walter further teaches the limitations of claims 27, 29 in (col. 3., ln. 46 to col. 4, ln. 5; col. 5., ln. 11-34).

Consider claims 28, 30. The examiner takes official notice that it was notoriously well known in the art of telephonic communication, based on Call Detail Record the most frequent

Art Unit: 2643

callers, new caller, call duration, unanswered or busy signals, etc., can be detected, since CDR is an accounting record produced by Switches to track Call Type, Time, Duration, Facilities used, Originator, Destination, etc. CDRs are used for customer billing, rate determination, network monitoring, and facility capacity planning.

7. Claims 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter (5,999,604) in view of Brouckman et al (6,134,307) as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of McNair (5,504,810).

Consider claim 31. Walter illustrates in fig. 2-3, 9, 10A-H a plurality of selectable report formats. McNair teaches a plurality of selectable report formats comprises a plurality of selectable map formats (see fig. 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of McNair into the teachings of Walter in view of Brouckman in order to provide benefits, such as improved connection efficiency.

Consider claim 32. The examiner takes official notice that it was notoriously well known in the art of telephonic communication, based on Call Detail Record the most frequent callers, new caller, call duration, unanswered or busy signals, etc., can be detected, since CDR is an accounting record produced by Switches to track Call Type, Time, Duration, Facilities used, Originator, Destination, etc. CDRs are used for customer billing, rate determination, network monitoring, and facility capacity planning.

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claims 33-34. McNair further teaches the limitations of claims 33-34 in fig. 5; col. 5, ln. 65 to col. 6, ln. 67).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-7527.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4708.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306 or (703) 308-6296 (Group's Fax numbers)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

October 18, 2001


**DUC NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**